11 SHARON PATERSON,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

No. 2:05-cv-00827-MCE-JFM

Plaintiff,

v. <u>MEMORANDUM AND ORDER</u>

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES, RAYMOND ASBELL, and INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendants.

----00000----

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Sharon Paterson's post-trial Motion for Injunctive Relief.¹

Plaintiff brought this action against Defendant Inter-Con Security Systems' ("Inter-Con") seeking damages for sexual harassment and retaliation under both California and federal law.

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Because oral argument will not be of material assistance, the Court orders this matter submitted on the briefs. E.D. Cal. Local Rule 78-230(h).

Case 2:05-cv-00827-MCE-JFM Document 205 Filed 09/17/08 Page 2 of 3

The matter was submitted to a jury which found in favor of Plaintiff. The jury also found that Plaintiff was entitled to punitive damages. The Court entered a judgment in favor of Plaintiff. Plaintiff now moves the Court to enter an injunction purging its records of any reference to Plaintiff's termination, converting her wrongful termination to a voluntary resignation, and confirming said voluntary resignation in response to any inquiries from Plaintiff's prospective employers.

Plaintiff's motion is essentially a motion to alter or amend the judgment entered by this Court to add an injunction relief which was never included in the prayer for relief in Plaintiff's Complaint. As such, Plaintiff's motion is governed by Rule 59(e)'s requirement that the motion be filed within 10 days after the entry of the judgment. The Court entered the Second Amended Judgment on April 14, 2008. Plaintiff filed this motion May 13, 2008 - well past the 10-day deadline provided in Rule 59(e). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is denied as untimely.

Further, the Court finds that Plaintiff has already been compensated for the injury she now asserts in that the jury awarded her "other non-economic damages" after her attorney argued that she was entitled to damages for future losses.

22 1///

23 1///

24 1///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

Case 2:05-cv-00827-MCE-JFM Document 205 Filed 09/17/08 Page 3 of 3

CONCLUSION

3 | 4 | F

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 16, 2008

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, OR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE